



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/681,530

10/08/2003

Steven M. Casey

020366-092600US

7288

83809

7590

01/03/2012

Qwest Communications International Inc.
1801 California Street, # 900
Denver, CO 80202

EXAMINER

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2483

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/03/2012

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/681,530	Applicant(s) CASEY ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID CZEKAJ	Art Unit 2483	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-9,11,13,14,17,29 and 31-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-9,11,13,14,17,29 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/21/10 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13-14, 17, 29, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee et al. (2006/0182055), (hereinafter referred to as "Coffee") in view of Ohto et al. (7119831), (hereinafter referred to as "Ohto") in further view of Andrews et al. (6900762), (hereinafter referred to as "Andrews") in further view of Cooper et al. (7146192), (hereinafter referred to as "Cooper").

Regarding claim 1, Coffee discloses an apparatus that relates to monitoring remote business locations (Coffee: paragraph 0002). This apparatus comprises "a plurality of telecommunications plant equipment having a set of equipment characteristics comprising information about the plant equipment relevant to servicing the equipment" (Coffee: paragraph 0289; paragraph 0568, wherein by making a service call, the equipment characteristics must be known), "a first network interface in communication with a network engineering center via a service network" (Coffee: figure 1), "communicate to the engineering center, the location and set of characteristics associated with the plant equipment" (Coffee: figures 18 and 20), "a portable technician device comprising a second location sensor configured to provide a location associated with the portable technician device, a second interface in communication with the engineering center, and receive from the center, an indication of servicing need for one of the equipment, receive from the center the first location and set of characteristics, and map a route to the plant equipment as a function of the second location and first location" (Coffee: figures 5, 9-10, 18, 20; paragraph 0161, 0344-0345, wherein the directions provide the mapped route). However, this apparatus lacks the first location sensor and the GPS location as claimed. Ohto teaches that it is difficult to understand the relationship between the provided information and buildings (Ohto: column 2, lines 40-47). To help alleviate this problem, Ohto discloses "a first location sensor to provide a first location associated with the telecommunications plant equipment" (Ohto: figures 3 and 13; column 10, line

62 - column 11, line 8, wherein the plant equipment would be housed within the building). Andrews teaches that determining locations within buildings is a difficult task (Andrews: column 1, lines 45-55). To help alleviate this problem, Andrews discloses "a first location sensor being installed at and associated with the plant equipment and configured to report the location and determining an installation location having a high GPS strength " (Andrews: column 6, lines 30-52, wherein the location sensor is the GPS receiver which reports the location; the determined location is the location on top of the building). Cooper teaches a first GPS sensor located within a cabinet (Cooper: column 1, lines 30-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Coffee and add the sensors taught by Ohto, Andrews, and Cooper in order to obtain an apparatus that better helps provide the relationship between the information and buildings.

Regarding claim 2, Coffee in view of Ohto discloses "a distance and direction sensor and calculating a third location based in part on the second location, the direction, and the distance, wherein the third location is the location of the object in the image" (Coffee: figures 5, 9-10, 18 and 20; Ohto: figures 3 and 13).

Regarding claim 3, Coffee discloses "the portable device comprises a transmitter that provides the location of the object in the image to a query database" (Coffee: figure 9).

Regarding claim 4, Coffee discloses "the portable device comprises a receiver to receive description information from the database" (Coffee: figure 9, wherein the receiver is the transceiver).

Regarding claim 5, Ohto discloses "the object is a landmark wherein the information about the landmark is walking directions" (Ohto: figure 13).

Regarding claim 7, Ohto discloses "a display operable to display information selected from the following: the image" (Ohto: figure 13).

Regarding claim 8, Ohto discloses "access a map, wherein the map includes a route from the image sensor to the object and providing the map to the display" (Ohto: figures 13-15).

Regarding claim 11, note the examiners rejection for claim 1.

Regarding claims 13-14, note the examiners rejection for claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, note the examiners rejection for claims 1 and 3.

Regarding claim 29, note the examiners rejection for claim 1.

Regarding claim 31, Coffee discloses the "equipment comprises inside or outside plant equipment" (Coffee: paragraph 0568).

Regarding claim 32, Coffee discloses "the equipment characteristics is selected from customer information" (Coffee: figure 20E, wherein the customer information is included in the message).

Regarding claim 33, note the examiners rejection for claim 1.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CZEKAJ whose telephone number is (571)272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe Ustaris can be reached on (571) 272-7383. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Czekaj/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2483